

Town of Montville Town Council  
**Special Meeting Minutes for Thursday, January 21, 2016**  
6:00 p.m. – Town Council Chambers – Town Hall

1. Call to Order

Chairman Jaskiewicz called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance followed by a moment of silence in honor of our military.

3. Roll Call

Present were Councilors Caron, Longton, May, Pollard, Rogulski, Tanner, and Jaskiewicz. Also present was Mayor Ronald McDaniel.

4. Remarks from the public relating to matters on the agenda with a three-minute limit  
Robert Manfredi, 9 Heatherbrook Road, who spoke in opposition to the Ordinance, distributed a four-page document pointing out the discrepancies in the Report, including the proposed staffing, budget, and benefits. He also corrected Councilor Longton's statement regarding the savings that would be gained by the establishment of an Independent Police Department (IPD). In addition, the Report does not mention the costs associated with the training costs, salary, travel, and benefits that each newly hired Officer would receive while in training. In his calculations, he estimates that, should the Town Council vote in favor of the Ordinance, there would be a budget increase of well over \$1 million.

Vic Lenda, 128 Kitemaug Road, stated his disagreement with the information provided by Mr. Manfredi. The proposed staffing, as indicated in Appendix D of the Report, refers to *sworn* personnel and does not include civilian employees, i.e., clerks or administrative assistants and dispatchers. He confirmed that the proposed budget includes the costs of an additional administrative assistant(s). With regards to dispatching, he noted that the Town was in the midst of discussions to join a regional dispatching service – an agreement that did not come to fruition – while the Committee was in the midst of their meetings. While the Committee agreed that a merger of the existing and, possibly, new dispatchers would be ideal, they would provide an estimate of the staffing and costs separate from the existing department so as to err on the conservative side. By providing additional training to the existing dispatchers, the cost for the staffing of the Dispatching Department would decrease. In addition, a cost savings of approximately \$180,000.00 will be gained as they will not need to upgrade the current State Police radios. Furthermore, a savings would be gained through the replacement of the Resident State Trooper (RST) by a Chief of Police by at least half.

Robert Manfredi, 9 Heatherbrook Road, stated that the current police dispatching is received free of charge from the State, while the hiring of five (5) police dispatchers would cost the taxpayers approximately \$300,000.00. In addition, he contended that Appendix C of the Report reflects an increase of \$890,000.00 and is based on a staffing of 29 rather than 37.5.

Howard R. Beetham, Jr., 60 Riverview Road, stated that the Finance Director is currently on vacation and he was unable to speak with her to confirm the numbers. Likewise, the Finance Committee held a meeting to discuss the budget for an IPD without her presence. He recommended that the Town Council wait to vote on the issue until the Finance Director can be present to answer the public's questions regarding the proposed budget. Currently, such items as insurances, Social Security, and retirement for each of the departments, including the Police Department, are grouped together in the Town's budget making it difficult to determine exactly how much is allocated for those line items for each department without the aid of the Finance Director. He also referred to an article printed in the *The Norwich Bulletin*, dated Wednesday, September 12, 2014, stating that the present system in the Town of Montville is currently meeting all of the Town's police needs, leading him to question, "if it ain't broke, why change it?"

Lt. Leonard Bunnell, 5 Little John Drive, encouraged the Town Council to unanimously vote in favor of the item, stating that the item is a very important and necessary item for the infrastructure of the Town as it provides a crucial service to the townspeople. He disagreed with Mr. Beetham, stating that the current system *is* broken and those who felt it is not should have attended the Committee's meetings to provide their input. The Committee was comprised of a group of very competent, qualified, intelligent, concerned, and positive individuals who were open to hearing any and all comments. Having worked for the Town for nearly 40 years, he and the Officers are aware of what it takes to do the job of handling 1,300 to 1,400 calls for service per month. He also confirmed that the numbers, as stated in the Report, are justified.

Robert Manfredi, 9 Heatherbrook Road, stated that there appears to be some negativity revolving around the title "Constable", as opposed to Police Officer, which he surmised is one of the driving forces of the Ordinance. No matter the title, the position carries the same salary and same benefits.

Vic Lenda, 128 Kitemaug Road, stated that the term is unrelated with the proposed item, adding that a Constable and Police Officer is the same thing and that, several years ago, the term, "Constable", was eliminated by the State Legislature. In addition, Officers are now able to pursue over Town lines, providing them with additional jurisdiction. He reminded the public that 26 Officers, including their benefits, are already included in the current budget and that the Committee is proposing the two (2) additional Officers to form an IPD. He reiterated that the replacement of the current RST by a Chief of Police would result in a savings for the Town and emphasized that the numbers are true and were obtained and verified by the Finance Director. The one issue that remains is the Dispatching Department, which, he is confident, will have a positive outcome.

Howard R. Beetham, Jr., 60 Riverview Road, recalled Lt. Bunnell request for additional Officers when he, himself, served on the Town Council. The number of Officers continues to grow leading him to question what would happen should the Town be mistaken and they decide to return to the RST Program? The Ordinance states that the Lieutenant would become the Chief of Police, replacing the RST, and eliminating all of the amenities the agreement provides. He asked that they take note of the liabilities, which currently lies with the State Police, and the resulting attorney fees — all of which will fall on the taxpayer's shoulders. He hopes that the Town Council will do the right thing. He reminded them that they were elected to serve the people, not the motive of one individual. The RST Program has worked positively for the Town for many years and with no complaints. The Town's three (3) Police Departments (Montville, State, and Mohegan Police Departments) and the Norwich Police Department, located two (2) miles from the Town's boundary, along with the Mutual Aid Agreement can work together to fulfill the Town's needs.

Donna Geary, 11 Depot Road, urged the Town Council to vote in favor of the Ordinance. An IPD would provide strong leadership and accountability for both the citizens and the Government. It would allow for a more efficient management of our police resources for such things as events, arrests, reporting, personnel issues, and community conflicts. While the RST Program was ideal years ago, the Town has grown and now houses a Casino resulting in greater and different needs. She posed the question, "when is the right time?" to those who claim that this was not the right time. According to a recent article in the *Economic Digest*, the Board of Labor Statistics claims that the economy is in pretty good condition and delaying the action would result in doing so at a higher cost. She also views this change as a step in improving of the Town's economic development as it would help make the Town more desirable to prospective businesses. She added that a vote against the Ordinance would not necessarily result in a positive vote for that particular Town Councilor in the future. In addition, a referendum would result in the expenditure of both public and private dollars. While the current system may not be broken, it is showing its age. The Town has no control on the costs or how the RST Program will work in the future, but, by

establishing an IPD, we could have control of our own costs. The Officers are deserving of receiving the proper support, strong leadership, and a professional organization.

Jim Moran, 308 Chesterfield Road, stated his support of the Ordinance. Not only has crime grown over the years, but the types of crimes, especially with the establishment of the Casino, has changed. As stated in the past, the taxes in the Town are primarily derived from the School budget and, should a crime occur, he would not be calling upon a school teacher to “save the day”.

Robert Manfredi, 9 Heatherbrook Road, stated that we should realize that we live in a “Kia Town”, not a “Lincoln Town”, adding that we would all like to have nice things, especially when we are not paying for them.

William Bucko, 106 Wildwood Lane, who served on the Montville Law Enforcement Feasibility Committee, stated that the Committee interviewed a number of individuals, including Police Chief Stewart, Stonington; Police Chief Pendelton, Waterford; Police Chief Fuchs, Redding, and; Major Darcy and Lieutenant Thomas, CT State Police. Major Darcy stated that, whether a town is a member of the RST Program or an IPD, the State Police would provide support and ensure that 100% of the Town’s needs are fulfilled.

Howard R. Beetham, Jr., 60 Riverview Road, referring to the comments made regarding the Board of Education budget at the Public Hearing, hopes that the Town Council will not cut the Board of Education’s budget in support of hiring additional, unnecessary Officers.

Chairman Jaskiewicz asked three times if there were any additional remarks from the public regarding the proposed Ordinance. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

5. New Business

- a. **Resolution #2016-03. THE TOWN OF MONTVILLE HEREBY RESOLVES** to approve and adopt the Ordinance titled, “Ordinance Establishing the Montville Police Department as heard at the public hearing held on Thursday, January 14, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. at Montville High School Auditorium. (Councilor Jaskiewicz)

Motion made by Councilor Longton, seconded by Councilor Tanner. Discussion: Councilor Longton reported that the members of the Finance Committee met on Tuesday, January 19 to further expand upon their understanding of the Report, its numbers, and how those numbers would impact the Town’s budget. A comparison chart was created comparing both programs on an annual basis, with the addition of items which would have a direct impact on the Town’s budget. The following items were noted:

- The elimination of line item 10870 Dispatching for the amount of \$304,050.00, resulting in a net gain.
- During the transition year, the Town could have an IPD for \$216,535.00 less than what the Town is currently paying for both the RST Program and Dispatching.
- The Town would gain a much more efficient Police Department based upon the numbers, which were reviewed, vetted, and verified as being accurate by the Finance Committee; reviewed with the (Montville Law Enforcement Feasibility Committee (MLEFC) Chair, and; determined with the help of and vetted and verified by the Finance Director.

As such, the Committee voted to present the chart to the Town Council for consideration. Councilor Longton personally recommended proceeding with an IPD, noting that out of the 125 individuals present at the Public Hearing, 46 individuals spoke: 26 in favor, 13 opposed, and 7 in favor of a referendum — a ratio of nearly 2 to 1 in favor of an IPD.

Chairman Jaskiewicz stated that, after speaking with the Finance Committee Chairman, he requested the Finance Director to re-check and re-verify the numbers, which she did. With regards to the comment regarding insurance, he corrected that, in accordance to the RST contract, the State Police are indemnified.

Councilor May stated that he had a number of reservations, which were extinguished as their meetings progressed, regarding serving as the liaison for the MLEFC as he did not initially see the need for an IPD. A total of 38 meetings were held over a period of 14 months, with many of the meetings lasting three (3) or more hours and during their meetings, the Committee met with a number of experts in the field. He enumerated the following reasons why he felt the formation of an IPD would be a better fit for the Town at this time:

- Continuity and familiarity with the Town – Since the Town’s inception of the RST Program, the Town has been served by over 20 (twenty) RSTs – an average of one (1) to two (2) officers every two (2) years and resulting in a lack of continuity and familiarity with the Town and its residents.
- Management and Resources and Management of Resources – Having a Chief of Police would improve the efficiency of the Police Department as it would eliminate the current dual polarity of the rules and regulations and policies. In addition, as discussed in one of their meetings with the Police Union Executive Board, precious time from their patrolling duties is lost as Officers must travel to the State Police Barracks to conduct certain tasks. An IPD would eliminate this loss of time as these tasks can be handled in one location, the Public Safety Building.
- Cost – The cost of the RST Program has significantly increased over the past five (5) years and, based upon the current State budget, the cost will continue to rise. These costs will be passed on to the residents, who will neither have a voice nor the opportunity to vote on the issue.
- Growth – Since 2003, the Town is now home to 450 hotel rooms, several new box stores, and large retail stores as well as a new sports complex. These additions bring people from other areas into our community, resulting in a growing transient population, which the police force must be prepared and ready to handle. As the result of these changes, the community is increasingly faced with different types of crimes. While it is true that the population in Montville has not significantly changed over the past ten (10) years, it has significantly changed over the past 20 years and current trends indicate that it is likely to continue to grow to over 20,000 over the next ten years. With this in mind, the Town requires a dedicated Police Chief to be able to accommodate the different and changing environment.

He commended the Committee on an excellent job, stating that it was a truly educational experience during which he was able to work with some of the smartest people. As Chairman Pike stated, the Committee worked diligently to ensure that the numbers presented to the public in their final Report are neither inflated nor created to deceive; they are real and true numbers, by which the Committee stands. He added that the Finance Director was consulted from day one in an effort to obtain the correct numbers, which have been reviewed and re-reviewed a countless number of times. There are definite additional costs, but, should the Town remain with the RST Program, the townspeople will not have any control over the costs that will be passed on to the taxpayers, regardless.

Councilor Pollard stated that she has listened to both the past and present discussions and is in favor of a referendum. Contrary to Councilor Longton’s calculations, by her count, it was an even wash for the issue to go to a referendum. She also stated her preference in having the Finance Director present during their discussions regarding the budget. She concluded by responding to Lt. Bunnell’s comments regarding her unawareness of the issue and costs during the January Town Council meeting.

Councilor Rogulski commented that he is torn regarding the issue and that there is much to think about.

Councilor Tanner also attended the Finance Committee meeting and thanked Chairman Pike and Lt. Bunnell who were both present to answer their questions. Following a

thorough review of the numbers, the Finance Committee, feeling that the numbers were strong, unanimously passed the proposed budget. She, herself, has reviewed and re-reviewed the details and spoken with a number of citizens, many of who are in favor of the Ordinance. The few who were opposed tended to, traditionally, speak out against any issue that would result in a tax increase. While she respects the opinions of those who are questioning their results, she wished that they would have attended their meetings so that they could clarify the numbers they are questioning. She expressed her concern regarding the possible increase of the RST Program to 100% in an attempt to handle the projected \$10 million budget deficit. With an IPD, the Town will know what the costs are and have the ability to control those costs. She stated that, while she is in favor of the Ordinance and hopes that it will pass, she is also in favor of a referendum.

Councilor Longton added that he, personally, confirmed that the Town would not lose the support of the State Police and all of the services they provide should the Town decide to establish an IPD. Prior to the Public Hearing, he urged everyone to not only come to the Public Hearing, but also to come prepared by reading the Report, which he personally distributed and posted a link to on social media. It appeared obvious that most of those who spoke against the Ordinance had not reviewed the Report, having stated numbers that were not actual. He verified that the numbers presented by the Committee to the public are real.

Councilor Rogulski questioned a recent article published in the paper regarding a statement that the Lieutenant is currently in the process of researching the acquisition of Town radios and a fingerprint machine. Councilor May responded that those numbers are included in the report as one of the non-recurring costs along with the impound lots, cameras for the holding cells, and a booking machine — all of which are necessary items for an IPD. Mayor McDaniel added that funds are currently annually allocated for their communications budget in preparation for the expansion of the range of the current system, the backbone of the existing EMS system and, if approved, the IPD. He confirmed that the radios, themselves, need to be replaced and have not yet been priced. Councilor May added that the radio upgrade will be required whether the Town opts to stay with the RST Program or not and those costs are included in the Report. In response to Councilor Rogulski's question regarding the monitoring of prisoners, Mr. Lenda stated that the monitoring of prisoners would be handled administratively, either by the Desk Officer, Sergeant, or Dispatchers, and no additional individual(s) will need to be hired.

Mayor McDaniel, as the Police Chief for the Town and having experienced the operational side of the Department, enumerated the following benefits the Town would receive that go beyond the additional costs:

- Local control; Selection of leadership to best suit the needs of community – Currently, the hiring process for the Town's RST is conducted by the Troop and the Town is assigned a Trooper, resulting in an issue with the continuity of command.
- Continuity of Command – While the Town has had some excellent RSTs and have been very well-served by the Program, during his four (4) years in office, the Town has had five (5) RSTs, requiring the Officers to constantly adapt to and learn a new system of working, which is difficult for those who are serving the public as a Police Officer on a daily basis
- Leader employed by the Town to whom their best interest is focused, a critical item that would ensure that the Town is led by one who is dedicated to, works in the best interest of and for the Town. He/she would neither serve two "masters" nor be pulled out of Town to handle other calls, but would be answering to the Townspeople, the Town Council, and the Mayor.
- Controlled cost of leadership – Through the efforts of the CT Conference of Municipalities and the CT Council of Small Towns, a compromise was reached with the State for Towns to pay only 85% of the costs over the next two years for up to two (2) RSTs, rather than 100%. In light of the recent issues the State is

experiencing in balancing the budget, a similar compromise may not be reached when this agreement has expired.

- Membership in Chiefs of Police Association leads to funding/equipment opportunities
- Independent Police Department established and maintained locally
- Policies of Police Department established and maintained locally – Currently, the Officers are required to follow both the Department’s Policies and Procedures and the CT State Police A&O Manual, which are duplicated.
- Communications simplified and costs reduced without having to utilize complex State Police System
- Eliminates the need for unnecessary duplication of reporting under CT State Police program and local internal system – While the Town has made a number of attempts to enable the Officers to record their reports into a shared database, they have been unsuccessful due to the strict restrictions imposed by the CT State Police.
- Allows for full access to NCIC/COLLECT (National Crime Information Center/CT Online Law Enforcement Communications Teleprocessing) which is limited under RST program
- Current fees for police reports are paid to the State Police for reports completed by Town officers...as Independent Police Department those fees are retained by Town – Similarly, the Officers will not be required to travel to Meriden or Middletown to acquire those reports as they would become locally available.
- Requests for outside assistance not hampered by State Police restrictions – Due to State Police Restrictions and the process involved with requesting outside assistance, precious time is lost. As an IPD, the response time will be more immediate.
- Requests for CSP assets streamlined outside of RST program
- Eliminate the need to fully copy all reports resulting in decreased workload for the administrative staff and reduce copier costs
- Reduce the need for Montville Dispatchers to screen and then transfer calls for police service or place additional call to Troop E to relay information, which should impact the efficiency of the dispatch operation and benefit citizens who will no longer have to relay the problem more than once
- As an Independent Police Department all services of the CSP, including patrol assistance for incidents, are still available by statute. This includes Internal Affairs and criminal investigative resources which are provided by CSP to all cities and towns if requested and/or needed – services include SWAT (Special Weapons and Tactics) Teams, Bomb Squads, and Police dogs. Furthermore, these services would be received quicker.
- Internal Investigations, if handled locally, are concluded quickly and with complete knowledge of Montville Police Department regulations
- As an Independent Police Department, we maintain the ability to conduct investigations in the most effective manner – Many investigations of narcotics incidents, in particular, have failed to be conducted despite solid information due to the State’s requirement to work with/under the Statewide Narcotics Task Force.
- Depreciation paid to the State for the use of the RST vehicle can more effectively be applied to a vehicle which will remain Town property
- Local arrest disposition records availability to residents – These reports must currently be obtained in either Middletown or Meriden.
- Prisoner processing time reduced allowing officers to resume patrol activities more quickly – For example, under the current system, should the holding cells be at full capacity at Troop E, the prisoner is transported to the Correctional Facility and, sometimes, another Troop for processing, which, again, results in the loss of an Officer being on patrol for several hours.

Roll Call vote, 5-2. Voting in Favor: Councilors Caron, Jaskiewicz, Longton, May, and Tanner. Voting in Opposition: Councilors Pollard and Rogulski. Resolution passed.

6. Remarks from the Public with a three-minute limit

Spencer Bauch, 24 Rhode Island Drive, thanked the Mayor and Town Council for their service to the community. He has been in public service all of his life and, just as we take the time to spend with our children and grandchildren, we are, similarly, investing the time and money necessary to support the Town's infrastructure, which would, in turn, support the community in both the present and future. Should the Ordinance go to a referendum, he urged them to ask their constituents to seriously think about the future of the Town.

Jon Leonard, 24 Chestnut Hill Road, who currently works as a full-time Dispatcher, stated that, while he does not have an opinion regarding the Ordinance, he would like to see it done right. He is dismayed by Councilor Longton's statement regarding the elimination of the line item for Dispatchers and spoke regarding the current issues with staffing due to the requirement of having two dispatchers on duty at all times. He added that the current radios are in terrible condition and is an issue of Officer safety.

Lt. Leonard Bunnell, 5 Little John Drive, thanked the Town Council for supporting the Ordinance, stating that it is, without a mistake, a plus for the Town. Neither the Ordinance nor the Police Department is about himself as he will soon be retiring. He would like to see the Town head on the right path as they have been attempting to do over the past year. The Committee worked diligently to accumulate the necessary information and thoroughly discussed the issue. He questioned where those who are opposed to the Ordinance were during this period when they had ample opportunity to have their thoughts and opinions considered. He recognized that there are issues with the current radio system and an upgrade is necessary and stated that the costs have not yet been determined. Any costs that have been publicized are pure sensationalism. The infrastructure of the Town must be determined by reasonable decisions and the time must be taken to do it right.

Howard R. Beetham, Jr., 60 Riverview Road, restated his previous statement regarding the population growth from 15,663 in 1971 to approximately 18,500 today, excluding the prison population. The Town is filled with numerous empty homes and rental properties reflecting the exodus of the population. In 1971, the Town had four (4) full-time, seven (7) part-time, and two (2) RSTs. Currently, the Town has 25 Officers. The population has only grown 20%, while the Officer staffing has increased to 600%. With the amount of taxpayers decreasing and the inability to sell their homes, this is not the time to require the townspeople to pay more and more in taxes.

Vic Lenda, 128 Kitemaug Road, spoke with regards to his plan for the Dispatching Department. He felt that, with the addition of the assigned Desk Officer(s), most likely the Sergeant and sworn personnel, the three (3) full-time Dispatchers will no longer be required to work 12 hour shifts. The additional staffing will alleviate the need to have two (2) Dispatchers on-site at all times. He is confident that, with the multiple overlap provided by the 5/3 (five days on, three days off) schedule, the current staffing will be adequate and any issues can be worked out.

Robert Manfredi, 9 Heatherbrook Road, raised the issue of food maintenance, possible needs for medical assistance, and liability of the prisoners who are housed in the holding cells. He also questioned why the Town purchased Molly if the Town had the ability to request Police Dogs from the State Police.

Wills Pike, 71 Pheasant Run, Chairman of the Montville Law Enforcement Committee, thanked everyone who took the time to read and review the report. He especially expressed his appreciation to Councilor Rogulski, who asked some very good questions and the public for their comments. He expressed two concerns: (1) the issue regarding the lack of telephone coverage at the Police Department, citing a recent incident he witnessed at Pa's Pizza during which they contacted the Police Department for assistance only to receive their voicemail.

He felt that the telephone at the Police Department should always be answered, regardless of the situation, and (2) two Officers with a dog were witnessed in the woods last evening. The Montville Police Officers are extremely hard workers, are very dedicated, believe in the Town, and are passionate about their work. They deserve the very best. He added that this issue is about the frontline safety and defense of the Town and should come before everything, including the School budget. He stands by the Report and the people and extended his appreciation to the Committee and the public who took the time to participate in the discussion.

Chairman Jaskiewicz asked three times if there were any additional remarks from the public. There being none, he continued to item seven (7) on the Agenda.

7. Remarks from the Councilors and the Mayor

Councilor Rogulski stated that there are two sides to a Councilor: one as a citizen of Montville and another as a Town Councilor. He is confident that the Lieutenant “bleeds black and orange” and believes him when he states that an IPD is necessary, but is torn with the cost and how everything is going to work, including the Dispatching Services. He feels that these issues need to be resolved, including a full understanding of the liability costs, before deciding to moving forward. He cited and implored everyone to acquire a recent Planning & Zoning Commission presentation provided by Town Planner Vlaun which clearly states the numbers and facts of how the Town has not yet fully recovered from the effects of the past two recessions. While one cannot place a cost on public safety and a great deal of information and a number of great points have been provided by the MLEFC in both their Meeting Minutes and Final Report, he is concerned with the rising cost of taxes to both the homeowner and the business owner as well as the manner in which the Governor holds the residents of the State hostage. He is also concerned with the economic development of the the Town as a number of businesses are no longer on the Grand List. He is confident that the Ordinance will go to a referendum. His vote in opposition of an IPD was not due to his lack of support for the Police Force, but due to the lack of information he has been able to acquire during this time period. Should he be presented with the necessary information and facts prior to the referendum, he will vote in favor of the Ordinance at that time, as a citizen.

Councilor Pollard agreed with Councilor Rogulski, stating that she is also torn and will invest her time and effort into a referendum so that the citizens of Montville can be heard.

Councilor Longton thanked the Committee for the Herculean effort they have put in to produce their Report, which clearly outlines the initial costs of an IPD. While the budget for the following years are an estimation, the numbers have been vetted by the Finance Department based upon the history of the Town. He added that not all of the members of the Committee were in favor of an IPD at the onset, but, following a thorough review of all of the information they had compiled, became, without a doubt, unanimously in favor. This is reflected in their final Report as well as their statements. He is “intensely proud” of their efforts. He also thanked the Town Councilors who voted in support of the Ordinance and those who presented thought provoking questions, adding that this is not an issue to be taken lightly as it would be a major change for the Town.

Councilor Caron also thanked those who came out and spoke either for or against the issue. While he supports the Ordinance and believes in the Town Council’s ability to vote either in favor or support of an issue, per the Town Charter, he also supports a referendum as he strongly believes that the citizens of the Town should have a voice in the matter.

Councilor May thanked the Town Council for selecting him as the liaison for the Committee, which is one of the most worthwhile Commissions he has served on for the Town. He is saddened by the fact that, out of the 38 meetings over a 14 month time period, approximately four (4) individuals from the public were present at one or more of those meetings and, when the issue was presented to the public for their final thoughts, a number of individuals stated erroneous information without having reviewed their final Report. He was pleased with those

who reviewed the Report, conducted their own research, and asked good questions as well as the good showing of residents at the Public Hearing of, by his count, 140 residents — 25 of who stated their support, 15 their opposition, and four (4) in favor of a referendum. He expressed his appreciation to the Committee, who did an excellent job, and is proud to have been a member of the Committee

Councilor Tanner echoed all of the previous comments. She thanked the Committee, who spent countless hours and thanked the Town Council who all did their homework and hopes the issue does move forward to a referendum and is confident that the people will vote in support of the Ordinance.

Chairman Jaskiewicz also thanked and commended the Committee on a great job. He noted his impression of some of the comments that were made at the Public Hearing that led him to believe that some might believe that the Police Department and its Officers were going to be changed. He stated that it was never a question of whether the Town had a great Police Department or not, nor was that every doubted. Rather, the change will pertain to a change in leadership. He is pleased that, by his count, 147 people attended the Public Hearing. He informed Councilor Pollard that the petition must be filed within 20 (twenty) days of the Public Hearing (February 12, 2016).

Mayor McDaniel thanked everyone for their hard work and opinions, not only those expressed at the Public Hearing, but also those received by telephone and throughout the Town. He found that most of the opinions he received were in favor of the Ordinance. He especially thanked everyone for their civility and respectfulness and hopes that it continues as the process moves forward. At the end of the day, they are sworn to do what is best for the Town and its people and they have a responsibility to ensure the public safety of the community.

8. Adjournment

Motion made by Councilor Longton, seconded by Councilor Tanner, to adjourn the meeting at 7:17 p.m. Discussion: None. Voice vote, 7-0, all in favor. Meeting Adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Agnes Miyuki, Recording Secretary for the Town of Montville

**AN AUDIO RECORD OF THE MEETING IS ON FILE IN THE MONTVILLE TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE**